

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 22 are in the application, with Claims 1, 9 and 19 being independent.

The pending claims are subject to a restriction requirement. In particular, the claims have been grouped into Claims 1 through 8 and 19 through 22 (Group I), and Claims 9 through 18 (Group II). Election of one of these Groups is required because the Groups are alleged to be distinct. Applicants note that the Office Action erroneously identifies Claims 19 through 22 as belonging to both Group I and Group II. The corrected grouping mentioned above was confirmed in an October 14, 2005 telephone call to Examiner Dinh from Applicants' undersigned attorney.

In response to the restriction requirement, Applicants provisionally elect Claims 1 through 8 and 19 through 22. Examination and allowance of the elected claims are respectfully requested.

This provisional election is made with traverse. Applicants request reconsideration of the restriction requirement in light of the following arguments, and pursuant to 37 CFR §1.143. As grounds for traversal, Applicants believe that Groups I and II are clearly not distinct from one another.

Restriction is proper only where an application contains claims directed to two or more independent or distinct inventions. As described in MPEP §806.05(f), the test for determining distinctness of claims directed to a product (i.e., the Group I claims) and to a process (i.e., the Group II claims) includes two prongs, and the claims may be deemed distinct if either prong is satisfied. The Group I and Group II claims were alleged to satisfy the second prong, which states "the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process". In particular, the Office Action alleges that "adhesive, soldering, glue" may be used "instead of using bonding step".

Applicants submit that the above-mentioned second prong is not satisfied because a process using "adhesive, soldering, glue" to make the Group I product would not be materially different from the Group II process. Rather, the Group II process encompasses any "adhesive, soldering, glue" that may be used to perform any of the claimed bonding, depositing and placing procedures. Accordingly, a process including the proposed "adhesive, soldering, glue" cannot be seen as materially different from the Group II process claims. Of course, the Group II claims also read on other processes for making the product of the Group I claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the outstanding restriction requirement and examination of Claims 1 through 22 on the merits. In this regard, Claims 1 through 22 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-0049.

Respectfully submitted,

October 14, 2005

Date



Nandu A. Talwalkar
Registration No. 41,339
Buckley, Maschoff & Talwalkar LLC
Attorneys for INTEL Corporation
Five Elm Street
New Canaan, CT 06840
(203) 972-0049